

**Remarks/Arguments**

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

**Claim Status**

Claims 1-10 are pending. Since no claims are added, amended or canceled, no listing of claims is required under 37 CFR 1.121.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

The indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2-10 is noted and appreciated.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103**

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Bogner (US 6,648,783). Because Bogner fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1, applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The present invention is directed to an engine fastening structure for securely connecting a cylinder body 3 to a crankcase 2. As claimed in claim 1, a crankshaft 8 is disposed in crankcase 2, and a crankshaft bearing 11a is disposed around a journal portion of the crankshaft. A bearing member 12 with a bearing portion 12b surrounding the journal portion of the crankshaft is insert cast in crankcase 2 for supporting crankshaft bearing 11a. A separate bearing collar 12d is fit into bearing portion 12b, and crankshaft bearing 11a is fit into collar 12d. Connecting boss portions 12c are also formed in bearing member 12 and extend towards cylinder body 3 from sides of bearing portion 12b. Connecting bolts 30a are screwed into connecting boss portions 12c to connect cylinder body 3 to crankcase 2. This claimed structure is illustrated throughout applicant's drawings, and is perhaps most readily seen and understood with reference to Fig. 16.

Bogner, by contrast, is directed to a tensioning device 1 for traction means such as belts and chains. The disclosure of Bogner is has no relation or relevance to an engine fastening structure as claimed by applicant, and applicant fails to understand the citation. The Action asserts that Bogner discloses a cylinder body 21, a crankcase 12 and a crankshaft 17. Applicant disagrees. Bogner's element 21

is not a cylinder body, rather, it is a tensioning roller (col. 5, line 46). Element 12 is not a crankcase, rather, it is a sliding or radial bearing that supports a bearing section 10 for rotation relative to a bearing section 9 (col. 5, lines 16-17). Element 17 is not a crankshaft, it is a drive shaft (col. 5, line 40). In this regard, Bogner clearly describes and identifies a crankshaft by reference character 24 (col. 6, line 4), and not reference character 17.

Thus, applicant does not understand the characterization by the Action of Bogner's elements 21, 12 and 17 in a manner that is clearly not supported by Bogner's specification, and respectfully traverses same. Applicant's claimed cylinder body, crankcase and crankshaft must be interpreted with reference to applicant's specification and in the context of an engine fastening structure, from the perspective of one of ordinary skill in the art. Clearly, Bogner's tensioning roller is not a cylinder body, a sliding bearing is not a crankcase, and a drive shaft is not a crankshaft.

Applicant's claims require a bearing member that is insert cast into the crankcase to support the crankcase bearing, wherein bolts are screwed through connecting boss portions formed in the bearing member to connect the cylinder body to the crankcase. Reference is again made to applicant's Fig. 16. Bogner does not disclose or suggest any structure that bears any correspondence to this claimed feature. There is no bearing member that is insert cast into Bogner's sliding or radial bearing 12 (identified by the Action as a crankcase) that supports a crankshaft bearing and that has connecting boss portions through which bolts are screwed to connect tensioning roller 21 (identified by the Action as a cylinder body) to radial bearing 12.

The Action further asserts that Bogner's feature 7 is a bearing collar fit into a bearing portion surrounding a crankshaft. This is not the case. As can clearly be seen in Bogner's Fig. 2 and described in column 5, Bogner's features 7 and 8 are tensioning arms that bias tensioning rollers 21, 22 to tighten traction means 23.

Appl. No. 10/501,380  
Reply dated December 6, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of September 6, 2006

Atty. Ref. 88528.0009  
Customer No. 26021

Since Bogner does not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1, claim 1 is not obvious over Bogner and the rejections under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn.

### Conclusion

This application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to resolve any issues that remain after consideration of this reply. Any fees due with this reply may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,  
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: December 6, 2006  
By:   
Troy M. Schmelzer  
Registration No. 36,667  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
Phone: 310-785-4600  
Fax: 310-785-4601